

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 22 are pending in the application, with Claim 1 being independent. Applicant amends independent Claim 1 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. The original specification supports these claim amendments at least at pages 4 and 11-14, and in Figure 2. These revisions introduce no new matter.

Claims 1-10 and 22 are now pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant's amendments and remarks after Final are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because they address the Office's remarks in the Final Action, and thus could not have been presented earlier. In addition, the amendments and remarks should be entered to place the application in better form for appeal.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): A., B., and C.

A. Claims 1-8 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,423 to Fischer (hereinafter “Fischer”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,451,147 to Kao et al. (hereinafter “Kao”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,845,082 to Murakami (hereinafter “Murakami”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent Claim 1 to further clarify

features of the subject matter. Amended **Claim 1** now recites a computer-implemented method comprising:

sending a request for network account credentials from an originating account to complete an assigned job, at a dispatch associated with a published object, the request directed to the published object associated with the dispatch includes identification of an unpublished object associated with the originating account, **the published object is accessible by an account without prior identification of the published object and the unpublished object is accessible by the account when the account is previously informed about the identification of the unpublished object;**

authenticating the originating account at the dispatch;

determining credentials for a network account to send to the originating account, the credentials from the network account facilitate the originating account impersonating the network account to complete the assigned job in a secured manner; and

upon authenticating the originating account, sending an emblem that includes an object and the credentials, for a network account to the originating account, the emblem sent to the unpublished object associated with the originating account and having the identification as included with the request.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed, taught, or suggested by Fischer, Kao, and/or Murakami, alone or in combination.

References Fail to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest Unpublished and Published Objects, and Determining a Network Account for Which to Send Credentials to Facilitate Impersonating the Network Account to Complete the Assigned Job in a Secured Manner

Applicant agrees with the Office that “Fischer fails to disclose that the request is for network account credentials where the originating account is authenticated and the network credentials are returned . . . fails to disclose that the request for credentials is for use in completing an assigned job” (Office Action, pg. 3). Fischer is directed towards preventing a trustee holding escrowed security information from revealing the information to someone

other than a party legitimately entitled to receive such information (Fischer, col. 1, lines 11-14). In Fischer, an applicant provides the trustee with the escrow information record which has been encrypted with the trustee's public key together with complete information for those items contained in the escrow record (Fischer, col. 10, lines 17-23).

However, Fischer does not discuss or even mention unpublished and published objects in a manner described in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Rather, Fischer describes utilizing documentary evidence by the alleged legitimate user and delivering them to the trustee for evaluation (*see* Fischer, Abstract; col. 10, lines 16-23; col. 11, lines 4-16), which is not the same as the features described in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Kao fails to compensate for the above-discussed deficiencies of Fischer. Kao is directed towards protecting users' passwords in a global sign on system (Kao, col. 1, lines 17-19). In Kao, a global sign on target information database maintains a list of target passwords for individual users of network, and provides passwords to the individual users to access a target (service, application, or information) by only requiring the individual users to remember one password to log on the network (Kao, col. 3, lines 33-50). Kao does not disclose, teach, or suggest "*determining credentials for a network account to send to the originating account*", as recited in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Rather, Kao describes a database maintaining a list of target passwords for individual users of network (Kao, col. 3, lines 33-34), which is not the same as "*determining a network account . . . facilitate the originating account impersonating the network account to complete the assigned job in a secured manner*", as recited in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Murakami fails to compensate for the above-discussed deficiencies of Fischer and Kao. Murakami is directed towards a recovery method for a resource managing server in a

distributed server (Murakami, col. 1, lines 7-9). Murakami describes that when a client wants to use a resource managed by the server, the client first requests acquisition of a token of the resource, and after the client succeeds in acquisition of the token, the client performs its job using the resource, returning the token when the use of the resource is completed (Murakami, col. 1, lines 59-67). Again, there is no discussion of published and unpublished objects, as described in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Murakami describes a server managing a resource by ensuring that the resource is not used by plurality of clients at the same time (*see* Murakami, col. 1, lines 59-67).

Applicant respectfully submits that Fischer, Kao, and/or Murakami, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest “*sending a request for network account credentials from an originating account to complete an assigned job, at a dispatch associated with a published object, the request directed to the published object associated with the dispatch includes identification of an unpublished object associated with the originating account, the published object is accessible by an account without prior identification of the published object and the unpublished object is accessible by the account when the account is previously informed about the identification of the unpublished object. . . determining credentials for a network account to send to the originating account, the credentials from the network account facilitate the originating account impersonating the network account to complete the assigned job in a secured manner*”, as recited in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Applicant reviews the evidence and respectfully submits that the evidence no longer supports an obviousness rejection as Fischer, Kao, and Murakami, alone or in combination,

fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every feature recited in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-8 and 22 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Dependent Claims 2-8 and 22 are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Fischer, Kao, and/or Murakami, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fischer, Kao, and Murakami, alone or in combination, do not render the claimed subject matter obvious, and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, is patentably distinguishable over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

B. Claim 9 stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer, Kao, and Murakami, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,566 to Ault et al. (hereinafter “Ault”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 9 recites “*wherein sending an emblem for the network account to the originating account comprises: proxy logging on to the agent; and, remoting an agent account to the originating account to complete an assigned job upon proxy log on to the agent, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the agent account*”.

Dependent Claim 9 depends directly from independent Claim 1, and is allowable by virtue of this dependency. As discussed above, Fischer, Kao, and Murakami, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Ault fails to compensate for the above-discussed deficiencies of Fischer, Kao, and Murakami in regard to dependent Claim 9. Ault is directed towards enabling continuous access to Web documents stored in a secure distributed file system (Ault, col. 1, lines 9-11). Ault describes using a session manager to perform a proxy login to a security service on behalf of a Web server, and ensuring persistent operation of the session manager by periodically spawning new instances of the session manager process (Ault, Abstract). The features of Ault are different from the features recited in dependent Claim 9. Dependent Claim 9 is also allowable for its own recited features that, in combination with features recited in Claim 1, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Fischer, Kao, Murakami, and/or Ault, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fischer, Kao, Murakami, and Ault, alone or in combination, do not render the claimed subject matter recited in dependent claim 9 obvious, and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, is patentably distinguishable over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of Claim 9 be withdrawn.

C. Claim 10 stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer, Kao, and Murakami, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,690 to Patel et al. (hereinafter “Patel”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 10 recites “*wherein the emblem is expirable, such that the method further comprises determining whether the emblem is about to expire, and upon so determining, renewing the emblem with a renewing authority*”.

Dependent Claim 10 depends directly from independent Claim 1, and is allowable

by virtue of this dependency. As discussed above, Fischer, Kao, and Murakami, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Patel fails to compensate for the above-discussed deficiencies of Fischer, Kao, and Murakami in regard to dependent Claim 10. Patel is directed towards communications system that includes a vault controller based registration application for managing the issuance and administration of digital certificates for use in conducting electronic commerce in the system (Patel, Abstract). The features of Patel are different from the features recited in dependent Claim 10. Dependent Claim 10 is also allowable for its own recited features that, in combination with features recited in Claim 1, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Fischer, Kao, Murakami, and/or Patel, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fischer, Kao, Murakami, and Patel, alone or in combination, do not render the claimed subject matter recited in dependent claim 10 obvious, and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, is patentably distinguishable over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the §103 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-10 and 22 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: 07/10/2009

By: / Dino Kujundzic 63,104 /
Dino Kujundzic
Reg. No. 63, 104
509-944-4762

Shirley Lee Anderson
Reg. No. 57,763
509-944-4758

Fees will be paid by credit card through the EFS Web, however the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency of fees and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number 12-0769.